

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Puerto Rico



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The structure of the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE), as discussed in previous APRs, operates as a unitary system serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rico Secretary of Education leads the PRDE and has two principal sub-secretaries: one focused on academic affairs and the second focused on administrative affairs. The Central Level office includes the Secretariat of Special Education ("SAEE" its acronym in Spanish), which is responsible for overseeing the management and implementation of the requirements stipulated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act ("IDEA") and is headed by the PRDE Associate Secretary for Special Education. Puerto Rico Law 51, of June 7th, 1996, provides autonomy to the SAEE and establishes that the PRDE Associate Secretary for Special Education responds directly to the Puerto Rico Secretary of Education.

Law 85 of 2018, known as the Education Reform Law ("Ley de Reforma Educativa"), sets forth the new public policy of the Government of Puerto Rico in the area of Education, establishing the following: 1) a decentralized Public Education System with Regional Education Offices, 2) the Public-Alliance Schools ("Escuelas Publicas Alianza"), among others. Article 10.08 of the above mentioned law establishes a modified or alternate diploma for students who cannot achieve a regular diploma.

Regarding the decentralization of PRDE, Law 85 sets forth a new administrative structure which eliminates the previously existing 28 School Districts, but maintains and works to strengthen the seven (7) previously existing Educational Regional Offices ("OREs" its acronym in Spanish) which are geographically organized and are located in the following Municipalities: Arecibo, Bayamón, Caguas, Humacao, Mayagüez, Ponce, and San Juan. Each ORE is composed of the following positions and units: A) Regional Director that is in charge of all matters of the ORE and responds to the Puerto Rico Secretary of Education and Associate Secretary for Special Education; B) Chief Academic Officer that is in charge of all Academic Facilitators, including the academic facilitators for Special Education, school improvement, academic support, basic curriculum (Spanish, English, Math, Science). The Chief Academic Officer is also in charge of the complementary curriculum, for example: Social Studies, Health, Physical Education, Arts, Vocational Studies and Special Education; C) Student Services Officer is in charge of the direct services for students and social support such as: counselors, nurses and social workers. The Student Services Unit also oversees the adult education program, at-risk students' education, and special education (including the corresponding Special Education Service Centers); D) School Officer ("Gerente Escolar") is in charge of providing support to the School Directors, i.e., Principals; E) The Accountability Unit is responsible for work related to the Puerto Rico Academic Assessments, Monitoring, and the Data Coach; F) Chief Operating Officer is responsible for federal funds, fiscal issues, and information systems; G) Auxiliary Services oversees the school cafeterias, school maintenance, all school transportation, security and others; H) Human Resources is responsible for hiring personnel, professional development and personnel evaluation; and I) The Legal Division Unit oversees and manages legal issues and complaints, including special education complaints.

During FY 2018, and since the issuance of OSEP's determinations on June 30, 2018, PRDE SAEE received technical assistance from outside sources such as USDE-funded technical assistance centers, NCSI, IDC (IDEA Data Center), CIFR and DAISY. For the 2018-2019 school year, PRDE SAEE continued participating in the NCSI Math Collaborative, which is positively impacting PRDE's SSIP activities and supports all States, with the same topic, to help and collaborate together through our struggles in the implementation of the SSIP.

For the third phase, second submission of the SSIP, NCSI representatives working with PRDE provided feedback and support to PRDE in preparing its report. NCSI has helped us in the engagement of the School Directors with the project providing us with tools and resources that have been very helpful. NCSI's support has also been of great help to PRDE in other areas such as fiscal, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) and others. The technical assistance received has been of great value to PRDE SAEE in making decisions related to its SSIP implementation, and particularly regarding PRDE's approach to the evaluation of the SSIP efforts.

Since the 2017-2018 school year, PRDE determined that one area of focus would be the implementation of PBIS. While PBIS is a PRDE system-wide initiative, the SAEE has been involved throughout the planning and implementation processes as a key stakeholder. After all the initial planning, including the establishment of a PBIS work-plan, implementation was delayed due to the impacts of Hurricane Maria. The work-plan was initially established for 856 schools, including the primary grades PK-8th grade. During the second semester of the 2017-2018 school year, the Regional Directors of the OREs were asked to identify PBIS teams in their respective regions. PRDE worked with the dissemination of informative material regarding the purpose and benefit of the PBIS Plan. During the period from January 2018 to April 2018, PRDE worked to ensure contracting and to have schedules in place for professional adaptation and coaching workshops related to the PBIS Plan. During summer school, various schools participating in the project were consolidated. In September 2018 the coaching level for level 1 was completed. Training's were offered to the 237 receptor schools who were participants from the PBIS work-plan. Continued monitoring was offered to providers to assure the deliver of their work schedules (i.e., workshops and coaching). The PBIS teams of the seven (7) OREs were trained in PBIS-Informed in Trauma and Culturally Appropriate through the integration of the Fine Arts. The workshop sought to reinforce the implementation, recognizing the negative impact of the consolidation of schools but also showing the possibilities that school closures bring to school communities. The opportunity was provided to process the significant experiences lived during the past school year by integrating fine arts to facilitate creative expression, without forcing verbal expression, for participants who wished to share them. As stated before, monitoring visits were carried out to ensure compliance with the work-plan and fidelity of implementation of PBIS by the contracted providers.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The SAEE general supervision system includes many components and is carried out at all levels of the PRDE system. At the Central Level, the SAEE has a Analysis of Data, Compliance and Monitoring Unit which includes the, Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU), which is responsible for monitoring throughout the Island to ensure compliance with IDEA and Puerto Rico requirements. The MCU carries out monitoring activities regarding the implementation of IDEA at the ORE and school levels. The MCU is responsible for issuing findings when non-compliance is identified, as well as providing necessary follow-up to ensure that the non-compliance findings are corrected in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification. Also included is the Data Unit, which is in charge of the Special Education data System, provides support of the data system and is in charge of all the 681-691 Data. PRDE SAEE carries out work at the regional level with significant support from its Special Education Service Centers ("CSEEs", by its

acronym in Spanish). The SAEE oversees a total of eleven (11) CSEEs in operation, which are located in the following locations: Aguada, Arecibo, Bayamón, Caguas, Fajardo, Humacao, Mayagüez, Morovis, Ponce, San Germán, and San Juan. They operate as a link/liaison with PRDE's Regional Education Offices, with some regions having more than one CSEE based on specific needs. The CSEE's were established to provide and assist students with disabilities and their parents with special education services. The services they provide include: registration, parent consent to evaluation, evaluations (Indicator 11), eligibility determination processes, re-evaluations, and coordination of therapy services. The CSEEs are a key component of PRDE's General Supervision System; they have the responsibility of ensuring compliance with Indicators 11 and 12 and that services are provided in a timely manner. Another important responsibility of the CSEEs is to serve as the liaison for children transitioning from Part C to B and their parents, including their referral from Part C, evaluation, and provision of services. During FY 2015, the Government of Puerto Rico established an initiative to positively impact the timely transition from Part C to Part B. Under this initiative, staff from the Puerto Rico's Health Department, that work on the Part C program, are physically located on the same premises as Part B staff in order to aid in communication and collaboration with the transition process. The location in which the staff is placed is called the Integrated Service Center. The initiative began as a pilot project in the Caguas Region in November 2015. This pilot effort has been a great success, and parents have been pleased with this arrangement, due that it has helped improve the process and ensure a smooth transition from Part C to Part B services. PRDE has been communicating with OSEP constantly regarding this matter and during April 2016 OSEP visited the facilities in Caguas and Fajardo (the initiative expanded during the 2016-2017 school year to a second Service Center which is Fajardo) observing the benefits for parents with children with disabilities. During 2018-2019 SAEE continued with the same two Integrated CSEEs with great satisfaction and feedback from parents. The CSEEs have the Assistive Technology Advisory Committees ("CAAT" for its acronym in Spanish). This committee includes professional experts who have the responsibility of providing the Assistive Technology evaluations.

The PRDE Special Education Legal Division (SELD) is responsible for receiving and investigating State Complaints. When findings of non-compliance are identified through the investigation of a State Complaint, the SELD is charged with issuing the notification of the finding, as well as with providing the necessary follow-up to ensure findings of non-compliance are corrected in a timely manner.

The PRDE Secretarial Unit is charged with managing due process complaints. The Secretarial Unit's responsibilities include the hiring and training of hearing officers and mediators, as well as follow-up activities to ensure hearings are held and that complaints are fully adjudicated within a timely manner.

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

PRDE SAEE has a Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) that is responsible for setting public policy on educational aspects related to the Special Education Program. The TAU is comprised of individuals who work with the following areas: deaf, blind and deaf-blind, private schools (purchase of services), pre-school transition (619 Coordinator), post-secondary transition, adaptive physical education, Assistive Technology, Autism and Assessment. Additionally, these individuals coordinate activities related to teaching, administrative support and technical assistance to schools, OREs, and Central level.

They also prepare and implement the technical assistance compliance plan of the SAEE with the purpose of improving compliance and/or indicator performance.

Throughout the 2018-2019 school year, SAEE provided on-going training to teachers, central level personnel, facilitators, monitors and other program staff on the program policies and procedures. The orientations have included how to create work-plans for compliance and data analysis. The TAU works in coordination with the Undersecretary of Academic Affairs on the public policy, process and administration of the State Assessment and extended school year.

In January and February 2019, the TAU participated in a consultation meeting with Private Schools regarding equitable services to develop the affirmative letter and on the recommendation for the Associate Secretary of Special Education. This particular year the process was done online and was published in the PRDE social media outlet, the link was shared with all private schools and parent committees island-wide for them to complete the consultation online. As a result, SAEE had the best participating rate since the last 5 years with 538 consultations completed from those 433 were parents.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

As an initiative of the PRDE Secretary of Education, in coordination with the Undersecretary for Academic Affairs and the Associate Secretary for Special Education, a Systemic Agenda/Agenda for the Beginning of the School Year is developed annually with the primary goal of providing uniform professional development at the start of the school year, including specific topics related to special education, for all personnel at the school level across the island. PRDE continues to implement this strategy, the training for school personnel is during the first week of August (the week before students return to school). Among the themes discussed every year in carrying out the Systemic Agenda are: Compliance with IDEA Part B including discussion of the APR Part B Indicators, post-secondary transition, Eligibility Determination, How to write Minutes in the IEP team meetings, MiPE, the Rosa Lydia Velez Case and related requirements, and parental rights, among others. The implementation of the Systemic Agenda training reflects the priority of PRDE's Secretary that at least once a year all school personnel will receive the same professional development which helps ensure uniformity of processes and practices island-wide.

Additionally, the school calendar which has to be implemented in all PRDE schools, establishes and separates one day each month that is dedicated completely for the professional development of all teachers. The topics for the professional development will vary based on the needs of each ORE, as they are responsible for identifying the priority based on their need. Additionally, as discussed above under the Technical Assistance System section of this introduction, the SAEE TAU provides significant professional development on a variety of topics through its technical assistance and support efforts.

In August 2018, The TAU Professional Development provided two Workshops specifically for the special education teachers. Also, during this month, the school directors, parents, regular teachers and special education aids received professional development on the importance of the School Directors role within the Special Education Program, data decision making and eligibility on special education.

The SAEE TAU identified needs for professional development for the Students Special Assistants (Aids), which resulted in developing an Academy for them that began in February 2019 with the following topics being presented and discussed: Special Education - A Team Work, Inclusion - A Right for Everyone, Creativity in the teaching process, Attitude and effective communication, How to manage students with visual impairment, Bullying: observation, action and prevention, How to manage students with Autism and How to manage students with ADHD. Also, in a collaborative agreement with the Red Cross, a CPR Certification was provided to them; as a result of this initiative, 100 aids were intensively trained and they can now provide the certification to new personnel, as needed within PRDE.

The Adaptive Physical Education ("EFA" by its acronym in Spanish) Program at the Central Level has a coordinator assigned to each region. This coordinator is in charge of carrying out annual trainings for Academic Facilitators and school level personnel that covers a variety of topics including evaluation for determining eligibility for EFA and EFA processes and services. Moreover, these coordinators participate as necessary in IEP meetings in which technical assistance related to EFA may be helpful.

During this school year the SAAE implemented the graduation route for those students whose placement is in a special education classroom, homebound, hospitals, special education schools and special education classrooms. The TAU provided professional development to the seven (7) ORE's in implementing public policy and on how to identify students for alternate and modified diploma. The first modified and alternate diploma will be issued for the 2019-2020 school year. The TAU is working on an agreement with the University of PR for them to accept the diploma so that these students can continue post-secondary studies.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAAE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

PRDE has had a copy of its FFY 2017 SPP/APR as well as prior SPP/APRs available on its website at: <http://de.gobierno.pr/educacion-especialmenu/603-cumplimiento/1031-plan-de-desempeno-estatal-de-educacionespecial>.

The FFY 2017 SPP/APR can be directly accessed at: <http://de.gobierno.pr/files/APR-2017B-PR-After-Clarifications.pdf>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions (formerly referred to as Special Conditions) on Puerto Rico's IDEA Part B grants annually since FFY 2004. These Department-wide Specific Conditions were imposed to ensure that Department grant awards are expended by PRDE in accordance with applicable legal requirements; implementation of appropriate fiscal accountability measures and management practices and controls; and ensure continued progress in meeting the programmatic requirements of Part B of the IDEA. OSEP will respond to the Commonwealth's FFY 2018 Specific Conditions corrective actions under separate cover. The Commonwealth's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the Commonwealth's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the Commonwealth of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the Commonwealth to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the Commonwealth to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The Commonwealth must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Commonwealth received assistance; and (2) the actions the Commonwealth took as a result of that

technical assistance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR due in February 2020, Puerto Rico must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, Puerto Rico must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, Puerto Rico must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since Puerto Rico's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies, and evidence-based practices that were implemented by Puerto Rico and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting Puerto Rico's capacity to improve its SiMR data. If, in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, Puerto Rico is not able demonstrate progress in implementing its coherent improvement strategies, including progress in the areas of infrastructure improvement strategies or the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity, Puerto Rico must provide its root cause analysis for each of these challenges.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State has not publicly reported on the FFY 2017 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) performance of the local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA. The links the State provided in its FFY 2018 APR submission were not operable.

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State did not provide the required information. Specifically, PRDE did not provide sufficient information regarding the sources of technical assistance received and the actions taken as a result of that technical assistance.

The State did not provide verification that the Indicator B-17/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) attachment included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17/SSIP, and OSEP accepts that target.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	56.54%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	56.50%	56.60%	56.70%	56.80%	56.90%
Data	56.54%	61.00%	72.55%	80.12%	70.99%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	57.00%	70.99%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEЕ personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEЕ held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	4,738
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	6,675
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	70.98%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,738	6,675	70.99%	57.00%	70.98%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

As reported in previous APRs, PRDE requested a deadline extension for reporting the four-year graduation rate data required under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(4)(ii)(a). In response to the PRDE's deadline extension request, a letter was received on July 21, 2009, approving the following: (1) use of a three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, (2) a one-year extension to report its three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and (3) to continue using the graduation rate in its current Accountability Workbook as a transitional rate until a three-year adjusted graduation rate in 2011-12 could be reported. Up to 2011-12, PRDE planned to continue to use the transitional graduation rate as described in the approved PRDE Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. This rate was an adaptation of the method recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics. At the time of the FFY 2012 APR submission, PRDE was in the process of completing the transition to the three-year adjusted graduation rate for 2011-2012, but the PRDE Planning Unit was still in the process of reviewing and validating data and had not yet reported graduation data using the then-new rate. As such, PRDE reported Indicator 1 using Puerto Rico's approved 3 year cohort graduation rate for the first time with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR.

PRDE continued reporting using a three-year adjusted cohort graduation rate through the 2016-2017 academic year (data reported in the FFY 2017 APR). The three-year adjusted cohort rate, starting with the 10th grade and ending with graduation in the 12th grade, was aligned with grade-level structure of most Puerto Rico high schools throughout that period. During that time, most of Puerto Rico's High Schools were composed of those three levels (grades 10-12). For the 2017-2018 academic year (data presented in this APR), PRDE has implemented a new administrative structure, which includes adding the 9th grade level to the High School composition. This alignment better allows PRDE to now calculate a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students starting in the 2017-2018 academic year.

The graduation rate only applies to students who received a "regular high school diploma" that is fully aligned with the Puerto Rico academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance or any alternative award. The definition is aligned with the definition of a regular high school diploma under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv). The requirement of PRDE is 24 credits to graduate with a regular high school diploma (Circular letter Number 34-2016-2017). This requirement is the same for students with disabilities.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As this is the first year Puerto Rico is reporting using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, PRDE proposes that FFY 2018 data be used to establish a new baseline for Indicator 1.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision. However, the State must change the the historical data to reflect the revised baseline for this indicator.

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	43.36%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	36.00%	35.50%	35.00%	34.50%	34.00%
Data	32.56%	34.99%	33.92%	32.34%	25.46%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	33.50%	33.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEI personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEI held various meetings with

the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and

significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,736
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	350
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	231
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,759
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	17

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,759	7,093	25.46%	33.50%	24.80%	Met Target	No Slippage

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

XXX

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

XXX

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

XXX

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

XXX

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

PRDE defines "drop out" for all youth using the same definition as used for EDFacts reporting requirements. Specifically, these are students who were enrolled in school at some time during the school year, were not enrolled the following school year, but were expected to be in membership (i.e., were not reported as dropouts the year before); did not graduate from high school (graduates include students who received a GED without dropping out of school) or complete a state or district-approved educational program; and did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (1) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program, (2) temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or (3) death. The definition is the same for all students.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.73%	98.50%
A	Overall	98.73%	Actual	99.04%	98.78%	98.87%	99.16%	98.54%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.44%	98.50%
A	Overall	98.44%	Actual	99.23%	98.98%	99.06%	99.03%	98.31%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=				
L			Actual				

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.74%	98.74%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	98.45%	98.45%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEE held various meetings with

the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made

significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SiMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	7,397	7,800	7,722	7,807	7,836	7,682			5,577		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,031	1,115	977	993	1,129	1,049			1,114		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,083	6,403	6,465	6,498	6,391	6,320			4,161		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	229	222	215	226	200	208			207		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	7,394	7,799	7,719	7,807	7,834	7,682			5,576		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,029	1,115	977	995	1,131	1,044			1,111		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,065	6,384	6,452	6,487	6,393	6,313			4,157		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	229	222	215	226	200	208			207		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	51,821	51,236	98.54%	98.74%	98.87%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	51,811	51,160	98.31%	98.45%	98.74%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Puerto Rico’s publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2018, including public reporting on participation of students with disabilities, is published and available on PRDE’s website at: <https://az-schoolreportcard-web.azurewebsites.net/>. Additionally, PRDE’s SPP/APR , which will be published once the final version can be extracted from the EMAPS system, provides detailed data on assessment accommodations and alternate assessments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments, and the number of participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	26.00%	26.50%	27.00%	27.25%	27.50%
A	Overall	24.28%	Actual	30.93%	29.79%	35.22%	33.46%	31.36%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	22.75%	23.25%	23.75%	24.00%	24.25%
A	Overall	19.30%	Actual	26.48%	27.30%	29.65%	28.91%	28.95%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					

H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	27.75%	27.85%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	24.50%	24.60%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEF personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEF held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SiMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	7,343	7,740	7,657	7,717	7,720	7,577			5,482		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	636	491	393	213	233	231			239		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,109	2,448	2,242	1,319	1,334	1,364			637		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	128	114	128	122	102	115			94		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid	7,323	7,721	7,644	7,708	7,724	7,565			5,475		

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	757	571	427	68	59	45			77		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,013	3,118	2,378	496	313	331			79		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	119	130	139	94	96	107			141		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	51,236	15,692	31.36%	27.75%	30.63%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	51,160	13,558	28.95%	24.50%	26.50%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Puerto Rico's publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2018, including public reporting on participation of students with disabilities, is published and available on PRDE's website at: <https://az-schoolreportcard-web.azurewebsites.net/>. Additionally, PRDE's SPP/APR, which will be published once the final version can be extracted from the EMAPS system, provides detailed data on assessment accommodations and alternate assessments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Test Response

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%
Data	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAAE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted

to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

7

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.00%	0.00%		N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

PRDE is a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in Puerto Rico. PRDE is composed of seven educational regions. Previously, PRDE operated four school districts within each educational region (a total of 28 school districts). During FFY 2018, PRDE eliminated the administrative districts divisions within each educational region while maintaining the seven education regions, now known as the Oficina Regional Educativa (or OREs, by its acronym in Spanish). While the OREs may in some ways operate similarly to school districts, they do not constitute LEAs, and this does not impact PRDE's status as a unitary system.

PRDE's status as a unitary system makes applying the actual measurement for Indicator 4a challenging.

On July 10, 2015, OSEP issued a letter to PRDE providing instructions as to the methodologies OSEP would require PRDE, as a unitary system, to use in reporting on Indicator 4A in the FFY 2014 and future SPP/APR submissions. Specifically, OSEP provided PRDE with two methodology options. As reported in the FFY 2014 SPP/APR, PRDE selected to employ the second option offered in OSEP's letter: to compare the rates of children with disabilities suspended or expelled among districts, although they are not LEAs as defined under the IDEA.

As such, beginning with the FFY 2014 SPP/APR, PRDE has compared the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 28 school districts (although they are not LEAs) within Puerto Rico. With the administrative change eliminating the 28 school districts, PRDE beginning in FFY 2018 will compare the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 7 OREs (although they are not LEAs).

Under this methodology, PRDE compares ORE rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability. An ORE is determined to have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least five percentage points more than the state's average suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (the "statewide bar").

The statewide bar is calculated by dividing the statewide total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days in a school year by the statewide total number of students with disabilities, and adding five percentage points. PRDE uses a minimum “n” size requirement to exclude OREs from the calculation. Thus, if the ORE has fewer than 10 students with disabilities who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year, that ORE is not included in the calculation. ORE rates are calculated by dividing the ORE’s total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days by the total number of students with disabilities in the ORE.

In reviewing all 7 OREs for FFY 2018, PRDE found that none of the 7 OREs met the minimum n size for this indicator. As such, no further analysis was required.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year’s SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

NA

NA

If YES, select one of the following:

NA

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

NA

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2012	Target >=	76.33%	76.67%	77.00%	77.33%	77.67%
A	77.84%	Data	77.46%	81.07%	70.26%	76.27%	72.09%
B	2012	Target <=	8.20%	7.70%	7.20%	6.70%	6.20%
B	5.76%	Data	6.48%	6.01%	6.94%	8.64%	9.22%
C	2012	Target <=	4.00%	3.80%	3.60%	3.40%	3.20%
C	3.62%	Data	3.10%	2.87%	2.75%	2.30%	2.23%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	77.85%	67.25%
Target B <=	5.70%	8.93%
Target C <=	3.00%	3.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAAE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into

consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	91,338
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61,418
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,168
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,225
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	43
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	399

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	61,418	91,338	72.09%	77.85%	67.24%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,168	91,338	9.22%	5.70%	8.94%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,667	91,338	2.23%	3.00%	1.83%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>The FFY 2018 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 5A. It is difficult to determine the cause for 'slippage'. As discussed in the FFY 2017 APR, one possible reason contributing to the slippage may be related to the impact of two significant hurricanes that hit Puerto Rico Back-to-back (hurricanes Irma and María) during September 2017. As has been widely reported, Puerto Rico experienced a significant increase in migration off of the island in the weeks and months following these two hurricanes. This resulted in a significant decrease in student population. Puerto Rico's total child count (ages 3-21) from 2016 to 2017 reflected a decrease of 11%, which was consistent with the decrease in the overall general student population PRDE experienced following the hurricanes. While many families subsequently returned to Puerto Rico following the 2017 child count date, Puerto Rico continued to experience significant migration off of the island, as reflected by an even lower child count for 2018.</p> <p>In considering reasons for slippage with Indicator 5A, it is possible that families with students with disabilities who are able to remain in side the regular class 80% or more of the day may have been more mobile and/or more flexible, and in turn, more readily able to leave Puerto Rico. Similarly, it is possible that those students with disabilities who remained in Puerto Rico may have experienced trauma that may have impacted their academic achievement and potentially required an increase in special education and/or related services. In turn, this could have resulted in slippage for Indicator 5A, i.e., a decrease in the percentage of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day for FFY 2018.</p>
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

PRDE is proposing to re-establish its baseline (which is currently based on FFY 2012 data) for Indicator 5A and 5B with FFY 2018 data. This proposal is the result of an analysis conducted of Puerto Rico's data for Ind. 5, as well as nationwide trends with Ind. 5, in consultation with stakeholders. As discussed in the FFY 2017 APR, and above with regard to possible reasons for slippage with Indicator 5A, Puerto Rico was significantly impacted by two hurricanes that hit Puerto Rico back-to-back in September 2017 (Hurricanes Irma and María). As has been widely reported, Puerto Rico experienced a significant increase in migration off of the island in the weeks and months following these two hurricanes. This resulted in a significant decrease in student population. Puerto Rico's total child count (ages 3-21) from 2016 to 2017 reflected a decrease of 11%, which was consistent with the decrease in the overall general student population PRDE experienced following the hurricanes. While many families subsequently returned to Puerto Rico following the 2017 child count date, Puerto Rico continued to experience significant migration off of the island, as reflected by an even lower child count for 2018.

In light of the significant impact on Puerto Rico's population, PRDE, in consultation with stakeholders, believes FFY 2018 data is more representative of the impact of the hurricanes on the population. This impact on population was not short term but rather has contributed to the new normal post the September 2017 hurricanes. Additionally, these baseline changes (from 77.84% to 67.24% for 5A and from 5.76% to 8.94% for 5B) would be in line with national trends. As reflected in the 2019 Part B FFY 2017 SPP/APR Indicator Analysis, the mean for Indicators 5A and 5B across the nation for FFY 2017 was 65.71% and 10.68%, respectively. Accordingly, PRDE proposes re-establishing its Indicator 5A and 5B data with FFY 2018 data.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide sufficient justification for a baseline change.

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for 5C, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for 5A and 5B because the State's end targets for FFY 2019 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2019 targets for 5A and 5B to reflect improvement.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
A	71.92%	Data	93.88%	73.00%	79.35%	78.46%	79.21%
B	2011	Target <=	0.75%	0.74%	0.73%	0.72%	0.71%
B	0.77%	Data	0.35%	0.20%	0.35%	0.19%	0.20%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	74.50%	75.00%
Target B <=	0.70%	0.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEF personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEF held various meetings with

the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as

"focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	11,799
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	10,161
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	27
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	10,161	11,799	79.21%	74.50%	86.12%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	27	11,799	0.20%	0.70%	0.23%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%
A1	94.10%	Data	92.31%	88.27%	90.51%	90.93%	83.17%
A2	2008	Target >=	57.20%	57.40%	57.60%	57.80%	58.00%
A2	56.00%	Data	66.73%	58.94%	66.27%	49.55%	52.33%
B1	2008	Target >=	85.80%	86.00%	86.20%	86.40%	86.60%
B1	89.70%	Data	89.48%	85.02%	89.76%	89.29%	80.00%
B2	2008	Target >=	49.50%	49.70%	49.80%	50.00%	50.20%
B2	48.80%	Data	49.59%	53.56%	61.87%	44.28%	43.19%
C1	2008	Target >=	91.00%	91.20%	91.40%	91.60%	91.80%
C1	95.50%	Data	93.72%	90.91%	92.79%	94.10%	85.06%
C2	2008	Target >=	69.50%	69.60%	69.70%	69.80%	69.90%
C2	72.20%	Data	69.79%	67.36%	73.63%	53.61%	56.74%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	94.11%	94.11%
Target A2 >=	58.20%	56.01%
Target B1 >=	89.71%	89.71%
Target B2 >=	50.40%	48.81%
Target C1 >=	95.51%	95.51%
Target C2 >=	72.21%	72.21%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEI personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEI held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools

include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

5,342

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	598	11.19%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	810	15.16%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,647	30.83%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,164	40.51%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	123	2.30%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,811	5,219	83.17%	94.11%	73.02%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,287	5,342	52.33%	58.20%	42.81%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	753	14.10%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	938	17.56%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,961	36.71%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,607	30.08%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	83	1.55%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome	3,568	5,259	80.00%	89.71%	67.85%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,690	5,342	43.19%	50.40%	31.64%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	530	9.92%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	730	13.67%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,556	29.13%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,381	44.57%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	145	2.71%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	3,937	5,197	85.06%	95.51%	75.76%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	2,526	5,342	56.74%	72.21%	47.29%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	The FFY 2018 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-A1. It is difficult to determine a definite reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE, and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE hopes for strengthening data quality. In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-A1 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.
A2	The FFY 2018 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-A2. It is difficult to determine a definite reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE, and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE hopes for strengthening data quality. In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	established for Indicator 7-A2 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.
B1	The FFY 2018 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-B1. It is difficult to determine a definite reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE, and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE hopes for strengthening data quality. In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-B1 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.
B2	The FFY 2018 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-B2. It is difficult to determine a definite reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE, and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE hopes for strengthening data quality. In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-B2 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.
C1	The FFY 2018 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-C1. It is difficult to determine a definite reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE, and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE hopes for strengthening data quality. In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-C1 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.
C2	The FFY 2018 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 7-C2. It is difficult to determine a definite reason for the slippage. PRDE has continued its efforts at improving and expanding the functionality of its data information system, Mi Portal Especial ("MiPE"). For the past few years, PRDE has been working to be able to gather and review data for Indicator 7 via MiPE, and was able to do so for the first time with the FFY 2017 APR. Previously, PRDE collected and reviewed this data manually. With the information now being maintained within and reviewable through MiPE, PRDE hopes for strengthening data quality. In analyzing the data, PRDE has realized that the targets established for Indicator 7-C2 may be overly ambitious and need to be revised. PRDE is continuing discussions with stakeholders regarding the targets in order to determine if the targets should be revised as well as improvement activities to be implemented such as technical assistance activities.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The process of data collection begins by completing the Resúmen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar (a translation of ECO's COSF). When the child exits preschool services, after having received services for at least six months, exit data is gathered using the same document (again, the Resúmen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar) to determine the child's outcomes in accordance with this indicator's measurement.

During FFY 2017, PRDE included the Resúmen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar within the PRDE special education information system, MiPE. To complete this document, the SAEE has oriented personnel to collect this information in two parts. The first part of the document is filled during the eligibility determination process through MiPE. The second part is filled when the child exited the preschool services.

PRDE SAEE prepared a memorandum that reviewed the instructions for indicator B7 in MiPE. In addition, a user guide for the system was created and published. Monthly follow-up was offered to schools in order to ensure the collection of required data, including the completion of the document. Staff involved in this was trained in the use of this document in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEЕ personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEЕ held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its

SiMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SiMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	89.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	84.70%	85.70%	86.70%	87.70%	88.70%
Data	88.05%	84.55%	81.62%	84.75%	86.09%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	86.10%	86.10%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
255	296	86.09%	86.10%	86.15%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

383

Percentage of respondent parents

77.28%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

PRDE includes all students served under Part B in its information system, and, at the time that PRDE selects its sample, all students served under Part B are included. The same process is employed for issuing the survey to parents of all selected students, regardless of whether the student is a preschool student.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX

Target B >=	XXX	XXX
-------------	-----	-----

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO
If yes, provide sampling plan.	XXX

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

A random selection of parents was used for survey administration. As PRDE's special education population for FFY 2018 was 103,137 the sample size would need to be at least 383 parents of students receiving special education services for 2018-2019.

Determination of the required sample was defined by the following formula:

$$s = [X^2NP(1-P)] / [d^2(N-1) + X^2P(1-P)]$$

Where:

s = required sample size

X² = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841)

N = population size

P = the population proportion (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05)

Accordingly, with a universe/population size (N) of 103,137:

$$s = [(3.841) (103,137) (.50) (1-.50)] / [(.05)(.05)(103,137-1) + (3.841) (.50) (1-.50)]$$

$$= [(396,149.22) (.50) (1-.50)] / [(.0025) (103,136) + 1.9205 (.50)]$$

$$= [198,074.61 (.50)] / [257.84 + .96025]$$

$$= [99,037.3] / [258.80]$$

$$= 382.68$$

s = 383 parents

As such, in order to have sufficient sample size, PRDE was required to issue surveys to at least 383 parents.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The parents of a total of 383 students with disabilities were selected by the sampling method to receive the inventory. A total of 296 of the 383 parents selected for the sample completed and returned inventories. This constitutes a 77.28% participation rate of the sample group. This survey depends solely on parent responses. PRDE’s sampling method allows for the collection of feedback from a wide variety of parents including variation and representation by school level, student placement and almost all types of disabilities. The response group was representative of the population.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

PRDE is proposing to re-establish its baseline (which is currently based on FFY 2005 data) for Indicator 8 with FFY 2017 data. This proposal is the result of an analysis conducted of Puerto Rico’s data for Ind. 8, as well as nationwide trends with Ind. 8, in consultation with stakeholders. An analysis of Ind. 8 data for the past five years reflects the FFY 2017 and FFY 2018 data to be more in line with an appropriate baseline, although still demonstrating improvement over the data of the past five years. The mean of PRDE’s data from FFY 2014 through FFY 2018 is 84.63. FFY 2017 data was 86.09, showing improvement from this five year trend, and allowing PRDE to continue setting rigorous targets if it were to use FFY 2017 as the baseline year. Additionally, this is above the national trends, as reflected in the 2019 Part B FFY 2017 SPP/APR Indicator Analysis. as such, PRDE, in consultation with stakeholders, proposes re-establishing its baseline for Indicator 8 to the FFY 2017 data. Similarly, based on this analysis, PRDE proposes revising its target for FFY 2018 for Ind. 8 to 86.1

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide a sufficient explanation for the change.

The State provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept the target because the State’s end target for FFY 2019 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2019 target to reflect improvement.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. However, in its narrative, the State reported that the response group was representative of the population, rather than of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. Therefore, it is unclear whether or not the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

NA

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionation representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

NA

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

NA

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	70.20%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.58%	96.99%	95.73%	96.51%	96.65%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
13,638	13,364	96.65%	100%	97.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

274

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Below, PRDE presents the ranges of days within which FFY 2018 initial evaluations were held. It reflects the total number and percentages of FFY 2018 initial evaluations both within and beyond Puerto Rico's mandated 30 day timeline for completing an initial evaluation. For those 274 evaluations completed beyond the 30 day timeline, PRDE presents the number and percent of evaluations that were completed within several range of day groupings. Notably, 229 of the 274 evaluations at issue were completed within 31 to 60 days. This means that 99.7% of FFY 2018 evaluations were completed within the federal timeline of 60 days ($13,364 + 229 / 13,638 = 99.67\%$).

Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate = 13,638
 Eval. Within 30 days or less = 13,364
 Eval. Within 31-60 days = 229
 Eval. Within 61-90 days = 29
 Eval. Within 91-120 days = 8
 Eval. possibly in more than 120 days = 7

As reflected above, PRDE completed 99.67% of FFY 2018 initial evaluations (13593) within 60 days, and 97.99% within Puerto Rico's stricter mandated 30 day timeline. Furthermore, PRDE has verified that 100% of children with parental consent to evaluate in FFY 2018 have received their evaluations.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

PRDE faces a shorter timeline than the Federal requirement (60 days), due to the Rosa Lydia Velez consent decree, which mandates PRDE complete evaluations within a 30 day period.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

PRDE maintains initial evaluation data within its State database, Mi Portal Especial (MiPE). CSEE level staff are responsible for entering initial evaluation data into MiPE.

As part of PRDE's efforts to ensure compliance with its State mandated 30 day timeline, PRDE uses an initial evaluation appointment scheduling system to help track initial evaluation appointments and ensure they are scheduled and held timely. This system, which maintains an electronic data bank of available appointments including the date/time by service provider, records appointments made for student evaluations using the student identification number. This allows for proper identification and tracking of appointments made, as well as follow-up for reports on initial evaluations pending from service providers, improving PRDE's controls over ensuring compliance with the 30-day timeline.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

PRDE identified one finding of noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2017, and PRDE has ensured timely correction of the finding of noncompliance. PRDE's determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The finding was corrected within one year of identification. In making the correction determination, PRDE verified that (1) the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented and that (2) each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified has been corrected. To verify the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented, PRDE reviewed initial evaluation data for a subsequent period of time and ascertained that children were evaluated in a timely manner, i.e., within 30 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

PRDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. Specifically, PRDE ensured that for each child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, an evaluation was performed, although late. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	13.17%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	82.04%	90.78%	96.03%	96.41%	97.11%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,664
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	8
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,168

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	471
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,168	1,185	97.11%	100%	98.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

17

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

The following information presents the range of days elapsed beyond the third birthday of these 17 children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday. Those 17 children represent just 0.01% of all children served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination during FFY 2018 (17/1,664). Reasons for the delays are discussed thereafter.

of children receiving services from Part C and referred for eligibility determination during FFY 2018 and were not determined eligible or provided with services by their third birthday = 17

In place within 30 days following third birthday = 11

In place between 31 and 60 days of third birthday = 0

In place between 61 and 90 days of third birthday = 0

In place between 91 and 120 days of third birthday = 1

In place more than 120 days following third birthday = 5

Reasons for the delays include the following: late referral from the Part C program, data entry errors, new staff, parent failure to keep scheduled appointments, Part C failure to send transition meeting notices in a timely manner, and facilitator failure to attend transition meetings. As PRDE improves its maintenance of documentation regarding reasons for delays, and thus is able to more accurately account for and reflect cases falling within this category, the resulting data is presenting a more accurate picture of PRDE's compliance with this requirement. PRDE is continuing to work to improve the means by which personnel consistently and timely document this information.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

PRDE conducted island-wide data collection and several validation activities in order to obtain the number of children who had been served in Part C and referred to Part B, and the number found eligible who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. During FFY 2018, PRDE continued to give follow up to those children identified as potential participants of special education services. Each CSEE has knowledgeable staff that attends to each child from the referral process to the implementation of the IEP. This personnel is also responsible for ensuring data is continuously updated in the system.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

PRDE identified one finding of noncompliance with Indicator 12 for FFY 2017, and PRDE has ensured timely correction of the finding of noncompliance. PRDE's determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. The finding was corrected within one year of identification. In making the correction determination, PRDE verified that (1) the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented and that (2) each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified has been corrected. To verify the specific regulatory requirement is being correctly implemented, PRDE reviewed data regarding children subsequently referred by Part C prior to age 3 and verified that all of those children received eligibility determinations, and if found eligible for Part B, had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthday.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

PRDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. Specifically, for each child referred from Part C for which there was noncompliance of the requirements of Indicator 12, PRDE verified that the child (unless no longer within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) was evaluated and received an eligibility determination for Part B, and if found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, although late. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	88.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.83%	97.63%	98.28%	96.37%	99.11%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
9,556	9,647	99.11%	100%	99.06%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

PRDE's efforts to obtain and validate data for this indicator included the following activities:

For FFY 2018, PRDE included the secondary transition checklist as part of the IEP review process for all students age 16 and above within the PRDE special education information system, MiPE. During FFY 2018, the checklist was used for the review of all students age 16 and above as in past years, however, this was the second year during which information was collected through the MiPE system. PRDE SAEI prepared a memorandum that reviewed the instructions for indicator B13 in MiPE. In addition, a user guide for the system was created and published. Monthly follow-up was offered to schools in order to ensure the collection of required data, including the completion of the checklist. Staff involved in this was trained in the use of this checklist in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation.

Special Education School Teachers were in charge of reviewing the files and initially completing the transition checklist for this indicator, in coordination with the SAEI Transition Coordinators. SAEI Transition Coordinators were in charge of training staff and monitoring the use of the checklist. Transition Coordinators are also involved in the IEP development and revision process. In total, PRDE reviewed the files of 9,647 students age 16 and above. The information for this indicator was requested through MiPE in a timely manner in order to verify the data.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	9	2	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The PRDE SAEI Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) issued a finding of noncompliance with Indicator 13 at eleven entities during FFY 2017, and PRDE has verified that all eleven entities have corrected the noncompliance. PRDE was able to verify that nine of the eleven entities corrected the noncompliance timely, within one year of identification. FINISH PARAGRAPH AFTER SPEAKING WITH MARIA DEL C.

In verifying correctiOn of noncompliance, PRDE's work has been consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In making the correction determination, the MCU verified that each entity (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified.

PRDE verified that each entity with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing data subsequently collected during on-site monitoring. Specifically, for each entity at issue, PRDE reviewed a subsequent selection of at least 5 files selected without advance notice of students age 16 and above and verified that all reviewed IEPs included appropriate measurable post-secondary goals that were updated annually and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet those post-secondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. Also, PRDE reviewed the evidence that the students were invited to the IEP Team meetings where transition services were discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency, as needed, was invited to the IEP Team meetings with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

PRDE reviewed each entity with an Indicator 13 finding of noncompliance and verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. For each entity at issue, PRDE reviewed the file of each previously identified finding of noncompliance to verify the correction of each individual case of noncompliance. Specifically, PRDE reviewed those specific files and verified that all reviewed IEPs included appropriate measurable post-secondary goals that were updated annually and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. Also, PRDE reviewed the evidence that the students were invited to the IEP Team meetings where transition services were discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency, as needed, was invited to the IEP team meetings with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	48.60%	48.80%	49.00%	49.20%	49.40%
A	48.00%	Data	63.24%	62.14%	56.32%	57.46%	51.10%
B	2009	Target >=	55.80%	55.90%	56.00%	56.10%	56.20%
B	55.30%	Data	66.79%	66.37%	60.12%	69.83%	65.46%
C	2009	Target >=	83.20%	84.00%	84.80%	85.60%	86.40%
C	87.10%	Data	86.85%	84.42%	81.08%	84.58%	87.37%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	49.60%	49.80%
Target B >=	56.30%	56.40%
Target C >=	87.11%	83.83%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAAE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAAE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made

significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SiMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3,257
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,927
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	312
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	390
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	101

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,927	3,257	51.10%	49.60%	59.16%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	2,239	3,257	65.46%	56.30%	68.74%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	2,730	3,257	87.37%	87.11%	83.82%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	It is difficult to determine the cause for 'slippage', which is based on comparing FFY 2018 data to a baseline that was established in FFY 2009. However, an analysis of Puerto Rico's data for Ind. 14C, as well as nationwide trends with Ind. 14C, led PRDE in consultation with stakeholders to determine the baseline, which was established with FFY 2009 data, should be re-established with more current data. An analysis of Ind. 14C data for the past five years reflects the FFY 2018 data to be more in line with an appropriate baseline for setting future targets, although still demonstrating improvement over the data of the past five years. In light of the unique situation PRDE faced during FFY 2017 due to the impact of Hurricane Maria, PRDE determined it appropriate to limit the impact of FFY 2017 data on this analysis and that comparing FFY 2018 data to the data for FFY 2014-FFY 2016 would be more meaningful. The mean average of Puerto Rico's FFY

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	2014-2016 data for Ind. 14C is 83.36%. Compared to that data, Puerto Rico's FFY 2018 data (83.82%) shows improvement. Additionally, this is well above the national trends, which reflected median percentages for Indicator 14C from FFY 2012 through FFY 2017 to range from 73.4% to 77.2%. Accordingly, PRDE proposes to re-establish its baseline data for Ind. 14C with the FFY 2018 data.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

PRDE did not use sampling. Nonetheless, PRDE analyzed respondent data and determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school (target population). The response group accurately reflects the target population. For example, the following list notes the make-up of the target population and the response group by disability classification. For each disability category classification, the percentage make-up of the target population for that classification is listed followed by the percentage make-up of the response group for that classification.

Comparing Target Population % to Response Group % by IDEA Disability Category Classification:

Autism: 3.9%, 3.9%
 Deaf-blindness: 0.0%, 0.0%
 Emotional Disturbance: 1.8%, 1.7%
 Hearing Impairment: 0.5%, 0.6%
 Multiple Disabilities: 1.1%, 0.7%
 Mental Retardation: 8.7%, 7.5%
 Other Health Impairment: 15.0%, 14.5%
 Orthopedic Impairment: 0.2%, 0.1%
 Specific Learning Disability: 65.1%, 67.5%
 Speech or Language Impairment: 2.8%, 2.5%
 Traumatic Brain Injury: 0.0%, 0.0%
 Visual Impairment: 0.8%, 0.9%

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As discussed above in addressing slippage for 14C, PRDE is proposing to re-establish its baseline (which is based on FFY 2009 data) for Indicator 14C with FFY 2018 data. This proposal is the result of an analysis conducted of Puerto Rico's data for Ind. 14C, as well as nationwide trends with Ind. 14C, in consultation with stakeholders. An analysis of Ind. 14C data for the past five years reflects the FFY 2018 data to be more in line with an appropriate baseline for setting future targets, although still demonstrating improvement over the data of the past five years. In light of the unique situation PRDE faced during FFY 2017 due to the impact of Hurricane Maria, PRDE determined it appropriate to limit the impact of FFY 2017 data on this analysis and that comparing FFY 2018 data to the data for FFY 2014-FFY 2016 would be more meaningful. The mean average of Puerto Rico's FFY 2014-2016 data for Ind. 14C is 83.36%. Compared to that data, Puerto Rico's FFY 2018 data (83.82%) shows improvement. Additionally, this is well above the national trends, which reflected median percentages for Indicator 14C from FFY 2012 through FFY 2017 to range from 73.4% to 77.2%. Accordingly, PRDE proposes to re-establish its baseline data for Ind. 14C with the FFY 2018 data.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for Indicator 14-C, using data from FFY 2018, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide a sufficient explanation for the change.

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for 14-A and 14-B. However, OSEP cannot accept the target for FFY 2019 for Indicator 14-C because the State's end target for FFY 2019 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data for Indicator 14-C. The State must revise its FFY 2019 target to reflect improvement for Indicator 14-C.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	1,177
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	327

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAE E personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAE E held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was

undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	50.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	52.25%	52.50%	52.75%	53.00%	53.25%
Data	52.71%	65.44%	62.38%	59.00%	70.82%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	53.50%	50.01%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
327	1,177	70.82%	53.50%	27.78%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During FFY 2018, PRDE experienced a significant number of due process complaint filings on behalf of students placed in private schools. An analysis of the data showed that the parties who filed these complaints appeared to be less interested in resolving the matters through alternative dispute resolution options such as mediation and the resolution process. As a result, PRDE saw a significant decrease in the number of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	525
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	298
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As presented in previous APR's, PRDE's stakeholder group is called the "Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial" (Special Education Advisory Committee). This committee is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and their families, and for providing assistance and feedback. The group continues to include representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization "Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos" (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), Down Syndrome Organization, the Puerto Rico Family Department, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the University of Puerto Rico, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, Parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, specialists such as a School Psychologist and a Speech Pathologist, an adult with disabilities and others. This FY 2018 SPP/APR was developed with broad stakeholder input. PRDE SAEE held various meetings with

the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR related to the individual indicators and FY 2018 data and reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. In these meetings the APR Indicators are continuously discussed, which leads us towards the targets established in the APR 2018. The stakeholders main recommendations were to establish targets that could be met by PRDE based on our performance and data from previous years. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE's FFY 2018 APR targets. The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit special education population and their families.

Regarding the SSIP the Stakeholder groups performed different data analysis to determine the focus of attention of the SSIP. After several meetings and significant analysis, the stakeholder group agreed on focusing on Indicator 3C, performance of students with disabilities on statewide academic assessments, as it revealed the greatest need was in the area of improving the academic achievement of our students. The decision was made to focus the SSIP on student performance (proficiency rates) in mathematics on the regular assessment. As a result of the data analysis PRDE, along with the stakeholder group, agreed that the SSIP would begin with a focal point on impacting the proficiency rate of sixth grade students with disabilities who were taking the statewide regular assessment, the PPAA, in mathematics and attended schools within the Yabucoa District that were designated as "focus" schools through the PRDE Academic Transformation Plan with Longitudinal view which is aligned with federal requirements. Taking into consideration feedback and suggestions raised by OSEP during their visit to PRDE in 2014, it was determined that intervention efforts to impact results on the sixth grade mathematics examination would begin with students at an earlier elementary level (beginning in 4th grade). The idea is that the students are impacted by the intervention before taking the exam, the greater the results that may be expected. This will allow multiple years of

intervention built up through the multiple years of carrying out the SSIP. Through Phase II and III (including the multiple years) the stakeholder group was expanded to include representation in additional areas related to the topic of the SSIP and how to include changes in infrastructure that PRDE was undergoing. The Evidence Based Practices (EBP) were presented and discussed with the stakeholders. During Phase III, year 1, PRDE made significant changes to the Puerto Rico Assessment System, formerly called the PPAA, which was replaced with a test called META-PR, Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico. This was an important change for the SSIP which was discussed and input from the stakeholders was considered and included. PRDE restructured the grade level organization, which was also another change, thus elementary schools include grades Kindergarten through 5th and middle schools grades 6th through 8th. Those changes directly impacted the first SIMR.

PRDE remains focused on increasing the mathematics performance for students residing in the Yabucoa district. However, PRDE has had to modify its SIMR to adjust to public policy changes in the Circular Letter 20-2016-2017, which established the changes in school organization related to elementary grade level. After various stakeholder meetings to review and re-analyze data, it was determined to proceed and establish a new SIMR, the baseline and the proposed targets. PRDE, along with its stakeholder group, decided to focus on impacting the proficiency rate of fifth grade students with disabilities taking the META-PR in mathematics within the Yabucoa District from the Humacao Region .

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	43.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	65.75%	66.00%	66.25%	66.50%	66.75%
Data	87.89%	95.73%	94.09%	91.61%	89.70%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	67.00%	56.76%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
298	0	525	89.70%	67.00%	56.76%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During FFY 2018, PRDE experienced a significant number of due process complaint filings on behalf of students placed in private schools. An analysis of the data showed that the parties who filed these complaints appeared to be less interested in resolving the matters through alternative dispute resolution options such as mediation and the resolution process. As a result, PRDE saw a significant decrease in the percent of hearings held that resulted in mediation agreements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Daiber Carrion

Title:

Compliance Officer PR Special Ed Program

Email:

carrionmdn@de.pr.gov

Phone:

787380-6997

Submitted on: